CHURCH AND STATE IN MEDIAEVAL GERMANY. III

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON
University of Chicago

The abbey of Cluny, from whose ascetic precincts the movement was destined to come forth to overturn the world, had a humble beginning. In 910 William, count of Auvergne and duke of Aquitaine, for the safety of his soul deeded to Berno,[1] abbot of Beaume and Gigny, a small tract located on the borders of the little river Grosne in the county of Macon, in the midst of the hills which marked the watershed between the Loire and the Saône, whence in clear weather one might descry the blue ridge of the Jura. No spot was more central to Christian Europe, for it was accessible to the Alpine passes into Italy over which ran the pilgrimage roads to Rome, and on the edge between Germany and France in proximity to the future broad commercial highway which was soon to develop through mid-Europe via the Saône and the Meuse rivers. The territory was neither French nor imperial, but part of the "middle kingdom" of Burgundy.

At the time of its foundation Cluny was in a secluded and forested spot. The original group of Cluniacs was made up of six monks from Beaume and six from Gigny.[2] After seventeen years of rule Berno gave way to Odo, a young noble, a native of the county of Maine, who had for some years been in the service of William of Aquitaine and had then abruptly renounced the world and come to Cluny.[3] With him the energetic and expansive history of Cluny really begins. He was the first of a long list of abbots—all of noble blood—remarkable for their moral force and administrative ability.

While nominally adhering to the ancient Benedictine rule, actually Cluny created a new type of monasticism, even though

---

[1] On Berno's life before he came to Cluny, see Poupardin, *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens*, 153.

[2] Sackur, I, 40.   [3] *Ibid.*, I, 41; *Vita Odonis*, I, c. 1.

its influence was exerted more to reorganize cloisters already estab-
lished than to found new ones.   Practically most of the *de novo*
Cluniac monasteries were those belonging to the Congregation of
Hirschau in Southern Germany.[1]   Cluny emphasized manual labor
less and study more than did Benedictinism.   It laid more emphasis
on moral character than on sentimental piety.   It frowned upon
bizarre and extravagant forms of asceticism.   It aimed to estab-
lish and maintain a balanced life, physical, intellectual, and moral.
The Cluniac monks wore a comfortable, attractive, even elegant
costume; their diet was generous and wholesome, and included wine
and beer.[2]   They bathed often, for with them slovenliness was a
vice and filth a sin.   The ascetics and fanatics in the order were
usually foreigners, as Hildebrand.[3]

[1] "Der Einfluss von Cluny im zehnten und in der ersten Hälfte des elften Jahr-
hunderts macht sich mehr in der Reform des Klosterlebens als in neuen Stiftungen
geltend; dagegen giebt in der zweiten Hälfte Hirschau auch der Klostergründung einen
neuen Impuls."—Waitz, VII, 185.

[2] *Vita Majoli*, II, c. 8.

[3] The tradition that the Rule of Cluny was not codified until the time of Hugh
the Great is now exploded.   The genesis of the Rule of Cluny has recently been cleared
up by Dom Bruno Albers, O.S.B., in perhaps the most notable research of its kind
since the seventeenth-century age of erudition—scholarly evidence that the genius
of Luc d'Achery and his fellow-students in St. Maur still survives in modern Benedic-
tinism.   These volumes are: *Consuetudines monasticae*, Edidit Bruno Albers, O.S.B.
Vol. I, *Consuetudines Farfenses* (Stuttgart: Roth, 1900).   Vol. II, *Consuetudines
Cluniacenses Antiquiores* (Typis Montis Casini, 1905).   Vol. III, *Antiquiora monu-
menta maxime consuetudines Casinenses inde ab anno* 716–817 illustrantia continens.
(Typis Montis Casini, 1907).   Before the appearance of these works the oldest written
Customs of Cluny were supposed to be the *Ordo Cluniacensis* of Bernard of Cluny,
printed in Herrgot's *Vetus disciplina monastica* (1726), and the *Antiquiores consue-
tudines Cluniacensis monasterii*, compiled by Ulric of Zell and printed in D'Achery's
Spicelegium, both drawn up in the eleventh century, though the relation of each to the
other had not yet been determined.   Dom Albers has revolutionized this belief by
the discovery of far more ancient compilations among the MSS of the library of Monte
Cassino and in the Barberini Library at Rome.   The result of his researches shows that
Cluny had compiled its rules before 930, that Abbot Majolus (954?–94) revised them,
and that a further extension and revision was made between 996 and 1030.   The
Customs of Farfa is edited from a Vatican MS which materially differs from the ver-
sion published by Herrgot.   Dom Albers has traced back some of the elements of
these customs to the Customs of Benedict of Aniane, who in turn was indebted to
the *Concordia regularis* of Ethelwold of Winchester, who again goes back to the
Capitula of 817 and the *Ordo qualiter*, which last was probably composed by an

From its foundation Cluny was under the immediate authority of the Holy See and free from the control of any bishop. Its material possessions enjoyed a similar immunity, for early in its history King Raoul of France (923–36) granted Cluny absolute and independent proprietorship of its lands, which made it completely exempt from feudal control—an evil which tortured so many monasteries in the ninth and tenth centuries.[1]

But the most notable feature of Cluny was its form of government. All the monasteries founded by or reformed by Cluny were directly dependent upon it. The mother-monastery alone was a monastery. There was but one abbot of Cluny. The affiliated houses were all priories,[2] though a very few which were so affiliated, out of courtesy, still were permitted to retain the old title of abbey, as Vezelay, St. Germain d'Auxerre, and St. Bertin. In this wise the famous Congregation of Cluny was formed. The priors were required to convene periodically in the chapter-general under the presidency of the abbot, and the latter made frequent visitations among the priories. How centralized this form of government was, in contrast with the complete separateness of every Benedictine monastery from every other, is manifest. It was the feudal system minus the looseness and particularism of that system. The abbot general was a grand suzerain. It was the adaptation of feudal

---

unknown Benedictine monk of Italy or Provence. The reader interested in this history may consult further: Dom Albers' summary of his editorial researches in *Untersuchungen zu den ältesten Mönchgewohnheiten* (Munich, 1905) and his article in the *Rêvue Bénédictine*, XX, 690; Miss Bateson's article on "Rules for Monks and Canons," *English Historical Review*, IX, 690; and Miss Rose Graham's review of Dom Albers' works in the same, XXIV, 121–24.

[1] The text of the bull of John XI is to be found in the *Bullarium S. Ord. Clun.*, 1. It is a matter of regret that Sir G. F. Duckett has omitted it in his two admirable volumes, *Charters and Records of Cluny* (privately printed, 1888). Cluny is not the first instance of this immediate dependence of a monastery upon the pope, as Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, I, 42, thinks, but it is the earliest notable one (Blumenstock, *Der päpst. Schutz im MA*, 33, Innspruck, 1890). Robert the Pious forbade the construction of castles in the vicinity of Cluny in order to protect it from the violence of the feudality (Pfister, *Robert le Pieux*, 306). For other examples of zones of protection see Mortet, *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire de l'architecture en France au moyen-age*, 114, No. xxxii.

[2] For list of the abbots of Cluny see Duckett I, 24 f.

practices and methods to monastic organization, the conveyance of feudal ideals of lordship, homage, service, fidelity, into the cloister.

This combination of feudal institutions and ideals with monasticism in large part accounts for the rapid spread of the order. Cluny was thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of the age.[1] It also accounts for the attraction Cluny had for men of noble blood and the large part they played in its history.

Like the earlier reform movement, Cluny's propaganda encountered bitter opposition from the monks. At Fleury the monks barricaded themselves in and hurled stones, shard, and other improvised projectiles at Odo.[2] At La Réole they killed Abbon, the abbot's representative.[3] But the efficiency of its organization and the immense appeal which Cluny made to the imagination of the time ultimately secured its success over all opposition. Under the administration of Odo it spread over Aquitaine, Upper Lorraine, the valley of the Loire, and North Italy as far as Rome.[4] Every new acquisition in turn became a new center of propaganda.[5] Under the famous Majolus (954?–94), Champagne, Burgundy (the kingdom), German Switzerland, and Provence were brought within its sphere.[6] With Odilon (994–1049) and Hugh the Great (1044–1109)[7] Cluny spread over Germany, Hungary, Poland, Spain, South Italy, and England. At the climax of the order in the twelfth century it ruled 2,000 priories.[8]

[1] On the history of this expansion see Sackur, *in toto*. A brief account may be found in Pfister, 282 ff.

[2] *Vita Odonis*, III, c. 8; Sackur, I, 80.

[3] *Vita Abbonis*, 16–20; Imbart de la Tour, *Les coûtumes de La Réole;* Pfister, 288–89; Pardiac (abbé), *Histoire de St. Abbon ... martyr à La Réole en 1004*, Paris, 1872.

[4] Sackur, I, 71–114.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 186–204; II, 133–54. For Normandy, Pfister, 309–10.

[6] Sackur, II, 232–52.

[7] Ringholz, *Der heilige Abt Odilo von Cluny in seinem Leben und Werke* (in *Studien und Mittheilungen aus dem Benedictiner- und dem Cistercienser-Orden*, Vols. V–VI (Würzburg, 1884–85); P. Jardet, *St. Odilon, abbé de Cluny, sa vie, son temps, ses oeuvres (962–1049)* (Lyons, 1898); Neumann, *Hugo I der Heilige, Abt von Cluny* (Frankfort am M., 1879).

[8] Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres monast.*, V, c. 18.

But before this summit was reached the great abbey had also invaded the field of the secular clergy. Without ceasing its agitation for reform of the monasteries it began to demand in imperative tones the reformation of the episcopate also. The French bishops were more deeply involved in the coils of feudalism than were the monks, and, moreover, many of them were imbued with the ancient Gallicanism of Hincmar of Rheims.[1] Indeed, Rheims, Chartres, Tours, and Cambrai together constituted a school of opposition. Instead of adopting a compromising spirit the Cluniacs aggravated the irritation of the bishops. They refused to acknowledge any rights claimed by the bishops over them, declared canceled all the ancient obligations of former monasteries which had become Cluniac, closed their houses when the bishops on their visitations asked for lodging, refused homage and the payment of those manorial dues which the bishops had long collected from the lands of the monasteries, imposed the tithe on their own account, diverted into the coffers of Cluny gifts which the bishops used to receive, ignored all diocesan or metropolitan authority, and dealt directly with Rome.[2]

It requires some effort of the imagination to appreciate the depth of jealousy, not to say hatred, which divided the two branches of the mediaeval clergy. The feud was due to rival authority, both spiritual and temporal. The bishops pretended to a kind of ecclesiastical suzerainty over the monasteries in addition to their episcopal authority and right of examination, often exacting an oath of homage when ordaining an abbot.[3] Many monasteries too were required to pay a portion of their revenues into the bishop's coffers. Then the bishops roundly abused the right of hospitality which they had the authority to exact upon their visitations, often quartering a large entourage upon the monastery. Title to church lands and the right to assess the tithe were also subjects of feud between

[1] Gerbert of Rheims, later Pope Sylvester II, opposed the Cluniac doctrine of the supremacy of the papacy (*Lettres* [ed. Havet], Nos. 192, 193, 217).

[2] See Pfister, *Robert le Pieux*, 313 f. The letters of Abbon of Fleury-Migne, *Pat. Lat.* CXXXIX, cols. 441 f., abound with information on this matter. Cf. Certain's article on Arnoul in *Bib. de l'école d. Chartes*, XIV, 455.

[3] *Ep.* Fulb. Chartr. Bouquet, X, 448 C.

the bishops and the abbots. The former opposed the claim of the monks to collect tithes, citing the capitularies of Charlemagne and the findings of councils to the effect that *decimae sint in manu episcopi*. The monasteries, however, interpreted this regulation in another way.[1]

The issue between the regulars and the seculars was fought bitterly at various synods in the last decade of the tenth century[2] and the first part of the eleventh, when the kings of France, notably Robert the Pious, threw the weight of the crown in favor of Cluny.[3] Hugh, archbishop of Tours, made a special trip to Rome to protest to John XVIII against the arrogance of Cluny.[4] But the papacy saw on which side its bread was to be buttered, and that it could diminish the powers of the bishops by supporting the monks and so enlarge the authority of the pope.[5] But papal intervention or even papal anathema never wholly abated the feud. For years there was strife between Fleury-sur-Loire, the Cluniac bastion in Central France, and the bishops of Orleans, which finally came to open fight on the floor of a council and culminated in the offending bishops being summoned to Rome.[6] A similar incident took place in 1025, when the bishop of Soissons and the monks of St. Médard resorted to physical conflict.[7] In the same year the French and Burgundian bishops united at Anse near Lyons declared null and void the papal bull exempting Cluny from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Mâcon.[8]

---

[1] The point is elucidated in a long note in Lot, *Hugues Capet*, 184, note.

[2] Pfister, 315–16.

[3] "Les éveques, cette aristocratie de l'eglise, étaient pour lui [Robert] aussi redoubtables que l'aristocratie laïque; ils voulaient se rendre maîtres dans les diocèses comme les seigneurs dans les comtés. Les uns et les autres avaient mêmes intérêts et représentaient le morcellement féodal.—Pfister, 305.

[4] Rod. Glaber, II, c. 4; Sackur, II, 87.

[5] Pfister, 319–320; Lot, *op. cit.*, 36. This feeling accounts in part for the Catilinarian invective of Bishop Arnulf of Orleans at the synod of Rheims in 991 against papal corruption: "O lugenda Roma, quae nostris majoribus clara patrum limina protulisti, nostris temporibus monstruosas tenebras futuro saeculo famosas effudisti. Olim accepimus claros Leones, magnos Gregorios; quid sub haec tempora vidimus? —Mansi, XIX, 131.

[6] *Vita Gauzlin*, I, cc. 14, 15, 16; Sackur, I, 273 f.   [7] Bouquet, X, 474.

[8] Pfister, 307, 317–18; Lot, 156–57; Hessel, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.*, XXII (1901).

In 1026 Count Landri of Nevers dispossessed the inmates of a monastery belonging to him and replaced them with monks from Cluny, whereupon the bishop of Autun threw his lands under interdict and so aroused the lay population against him.[1] At Tours there was prolonged quarrel between Archbishop Archambaud and the monks of St. Martin.[2]

Quite as acrimonious as these quarrels dividing the bishops and the monks was the protracted feud between the monks and the feudal nobles, who resented Cluny's attacks upon their immemorial feudal right to appoint to church livings and control church revenues. The history of the first Capetian kings of France, of the dukes of Normandy and Burgundy, and of the counts of Anjou and Champagne is filled with this struggle.[3]

The Cluny reform in its original purpose and policy and in its ultimate application constituted two very different movements, so different that the two were actually separate and distinct propaganda. The original Cluniac movement was a real movement for moral reform and was exerted in the monasteries only. It was a renaissance of the old ideals of poverty and chastity and aimed to emancipate the monasteries from the worldly and feudal practices which had been intruded into them. Owing to the peculiar conditions of its foundation Cluny was free from the prevailing confusion which obtained in other cloisters, for it was independently governed under its own abbot. Thus Cluny tasted of the sweets of independence and was free from political control, as other foundations were not. Moreover there was undeniably a deeper spiritual life at Cluny.

If the reform had continued to be solely a reformation movement seeking to purify the morals of the clergy and to eliminate the grosser features of feudal abuse its propaganda would have been both reasonable and salutary. But when the Cluny reform began to preach church independence as well as moral reform it invaded

---

[1] Petit, *Hist. des ducs de Bourgogne*, éclairissements 17–18, 27.

[2] *Lettres de Gerbert* (ed. Havet), 190–91.

[3] See Sackur, II, 24 f.; Pfister, 180 f.; Luchaire, *Inst. mon. de la France*, II, 72 f.; Imbart de la Tour, *Les élections épiscopales*, 177 f.; Viollet, *Inst. polit.*, I, 416 f.; Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, II, Part II. Book 1, chaps. iv and v, Book 2, chap. i.

the field of politics and at once took issue with the secular authority, whose supremacy it challenged. This second stage was reached when the Cluny reform became identified with the papacy, in whose hand it became the weapon for the establishment of a universal dominion, and may then be fittingly termed the Gregorian reform. For its purposes then were less religious than political, less moral than monarchical. This is the Roman stage of the Cluny reform.

Yet the movement was Italian before it became Roman. But even thus early it was anti-German in its direction. Lombard and Tuscan Italy by the middle of the eleventh century had begun to chafe under German domination, and that a domination chiefly maintained by the imposition of German bishops in Italian sees. For the emperors, both Saxon and Franconian, distrusting the native ecclesiastics, systematically appointed German bishops to Italian sees. Between 950 and 1000 the presence of 47 German bishops in the bishoprics of Italy is attested, and undoubtedly there were more of such of whom we have no record. The precaution was warranted, for by the time of Henry II all the prominent noble families of North Italy were allied against German domination south of the Alps. Within twenty-four days after the death of Otto III in 1002, on February 15, in the church of St. Michael at Pavia, Arduin, margrave of Ivrea, already famous for his hostility to the Germans in Italy, assumed the Iron Crown of Lombardy.[1] Two years later the Pavians destroyed the German castle which was the key to their hold upon the city.[2]

But the Pretender had undertaken an impossible task. Henry II crossed the Alps in the spring of 1004 and gave Pavia over to the flames, though Arduin escaped and continued to call himself king of Italy until his death in 1015.[3] The news of the emperor's death at Grona, on Saxon soil, in 1024 was received with shouts of rejoicing in Lombardy, where the populace of Pavia utterly destroyed the new citadel which Henry II had built.[4] Conrad II again riveted

---

[1] Pfister, 362, n. 1.   [2] Giesebrecht, II, 231 f.; Lamprecht, II, 278–79.

[3] Pfister, 362; Sackur, II, 14; Provena, *Studi critici sopra la storia d'Italia a' tempi del re Ardoino*, Turin, 1844.

[4] Wipo, *Vita Chonradi*, c. 7.

German domination upon the turbulent country and colonized it with German bishops and German soldiery.[1] His humiliation of the archbishop of Milan and devastation of Parma[2] foiled a plot for the massacre of all the Germans in Lombardy[3].

Italy was sullen and sore under the German heel. But though revolt after revolt failed, nevertheless Arduin of Ivrea and later conspirators managed to sow dragons' teeth in the path of the Germans. In 1004 Arduin had vainly made overtures to Robert of France, true to the traditional Italian policy of seeking some powerful intervention from without, when he perceived that his cause was failing. The suggestion was not lost. When Arduin died the Italian anti-German party offered to yield the March of Ivrea to Rodolph, king of the Two Burgundies, as the price of his intervention,[4] and when Henry II died in 1024 they offered the Italian crown successively to a son of Robert the Pious, to William of Aquitaine, and finally to Odo, count of Champagne, who in 1037 invaded Lorraine, took Commercy, failed before Toul, and laid siege to Bar-le-Duc, where he was slain (November 15).[5] Once more retribution was visited by Conrad II upon the rebellious cities of Italy, especially Pavia and Parma.[6] However much Italy might be divided against itself with warring feudal houses and rival bishops, its hatred of German domination and of the Germans has almost the dignity of a national feeling. The chronicles for every century, even from

[1] The subject of German bishops in Italian sees in these times has recently been attentively studied in three dissertations: Groner, *Die Diözesen Italiens von der Mitte des zehnten bis zum Ende des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1904); Pahncke, *Geschichte der Bischöfe Italiens deutscher Nation von 951–1004* (Halle diss., 1912); Schwartz, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern* (Freiburg i, Br. diss., 1913).

[2] Pabst, *De Ariberto II, Mediolanensi primisque medii aevi motibus popularibus* (Berlin diss., 1864); cf. the array of sources and authorities in Richter, *Annalen*, III, Part II, pp. 312–20.

[3] Nitzsch, II, 32. For the Romans' hatred of the Germans in 962 see *Benedicti chronicon*, I, c. 39, SS. III, 719. For general evidence: Liutprand, *Antapod.*, I, 23; *Gesta Bereng.*, III vss. 80 f.; Regino, *Chron.*, annis 894, 896; *Annal. Fuld.*, 886; Folcuin, *Gesta abbat. Leob.*, c. 28, SS. IV, 69; *Annal. Qued.*, 1014; Sackur, I, 321 ff.

[4] Pfister, 367–70.

[5] Giesebrecht, II, 231 f.; Lamprecht, II, 278–79; Richter, III, Part II, pp. 273–74 (annis 1025–27).

[6] Richter, III, Part II, pp. 311, 319 (anno 1037).

before the permanent establishment of German rule by Otto the Great in 962, bristle with the evidences of it.

Ever since the intervention in Italy in 901 of King Louis of Burgundy, whom Pope Benedict IV had crowned emperor after Arnulf's death, Italy had been a field of exploitation for adventurous and greedy transalpine Burgundians and Provencaux.[1] The overtures of the rebellious Italians in the reigns of Henry II and Conrad II to Robert the Pious, William of Aquitaine, Rodolph of Burgundy, and Odo of Champagne increased this French influx. It was the Italian national party which saw the political advantage latent in the Cluny reform, abandoned open revolt for more insidious conspiracy, and began to agitate against lay investiture as a means of emancipating Italy from German rule. Then and there the Cluny reform became a formidable political movement against the German monarchy, all the more formidable because under the guise of religion it could pursue its purposes. "Reform" became a means to an end, and that end the liberation of Italy. In soil so fertile with an anti-German spirit the Cluny reform found a congenial field. . Many of the rebellious Italian nobles were ardent devotees of Cluny. Arduin of Ivrea, who had rebelled at the death of Otto III and had had himself crowned king of the Lombards at Pavia in 1102, and whom Henry II crushed, terminated his stormy career in Fructuaria, one of the earliest Cluniac foundations.[2]

But if the independence of Italy could be so secured, why not also that of the church in the same way? And if the independence of the church, why not the supremacy of the church? It was this enormous possibility in the application of the Cluny reform which Hildebrand saw, as did no other man, while he was yet little more than a simple monk. He saw the tremendous implications in the issue: that by identifying the papacy with a war to abolish lay investiture the papacy might not only emancipate the church from secular control, but subordinate, even demolish, the state. "Aboli-

---

[1] Poupardin, 65–66, 223, and especially 377–99; Gregorovius, III, Book 6, cc. 1–2; La Potre, *L' Europe et la St. Siège l'époque Càrolingien*, 330–34. For Italian feeling toward these adventurers from beyond the Alps see Liutprand, *Antapod*, Book II, c. 60; Book III, c. 44; Book V, c. 6.

[2] Fructuaria was founded by William of St. Bénigne in 1003 (Pfister, 266); Abbé Chevalier, *Le vénérable Guillaume, abbé de St. Bénigne*, 86.

tion of simony" was to become the slogan of papal victory. The Cluny reform might be made an Archimedean lever with which to overthrow the world: *Eripiet coelo fulmen sceptrumque tyrannis.* The time was not yet ripe to unveil a program of such colossal magnitude, but it was implicit in the enterprise of the Italian nationalist party.[1] Arduin of Ivrea's rebellion had exhibited marked antiepiscopal tendencies.[2]

It is obvious that the original nature of the Cluny reform and this Italian nationalist expression of it were two very different movements. Italy had early become a seed plot of the real reform, for its clergy in the tenth century was perhaps even more degraded and corrupt than that north of the Alps. Even corrupt and mutilated forms of ancient paganism had resurgence.[3] The Benedictine rule was a reminiscence in such famous monasteries as Monte Cassino, San Vincenzo, Farfa, Peschiera, and Subiaco.[4] Marozia and Theodora paid their soldiery with money and plate taken from Roman convents.[5]

The Cluny reform was introduced into Italy by Odo, the second abbot, whom Alberigo, founder of a short-lived Roman republic (932–54), is alleged to have made abbot general over all the monasteries in Rome and its environs. In any case the famous monastery of Sancta Maria, where Hildebrand was educated, was established at this time on the Aventine in a palace given over to it by Alberigo, and a long series of old foundations reorganized by Odo, as St. Lorenzo, St. Andrew, St. Agnes, St. Sylvester, St. Stephen, Subiaco, Farfa, St. Peter in Pavia, and finally Monte Cassino. When Odo died in 944 the progress of the Cluny reform in Italy was interrupted for two decades, but was resumed under Majolus (954 ?–94).

[1] Giesebrecht, II, 30 f.; Lamprecht, II, 278 f.; Sackur, II, 1–14. Contemporary Italian literature at this time shows marked French influence and is prevailingly hostile to the Germans (Zimmer, *Roman. Forsch.*, XXIX [1911]).

[2] Giesebrecht, II, 240; Lamprecht, II, 284.

[3] Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengesch. der italien. Geistlichkeit im X. und XI. Jahrh.* (1890), 51 f., 174 f., 263 f., 307 f., 362 f.; Schulz, *Atto von Vercelli*, 40 f.; Vogel, *Rather von Verona*, I, 43 f.; Sackur, I, 93 f.; Nitzsch, I, 338–39.

[4] Gregorovius, Book 6, c. 12, sec. 3 (Eng. trans., III, 307–10).

[5] Sackur, I, 96–97. On Farfa see Gregorovius, III, 314–15 (Eng. trans.).

In 971 St. Savior in Pavia was reformed, in 972 St. Apollinaris near Ravenna, in 982 St. John in Parma, in 987 Monte Celio in Pavia, where Odo had been successfully resisted by the monks some years before. Pavia, significantly for the seat of the Italian national party, at this time indubitably the richest and most populous city in North Italy, became the chief seat of the order in Italy, where Cluny in 967 had acquired extensive lands both within the city and along the banks of the Po.[1] The reformation of Farfa about the year 1000 was the work of Majolus' successor, Odilon, who founded La Cava near Naples in 1025. Odilon's greatest conquests though were made in Piedmont, where Fructuaria was established in 1003 by Odilon's able assistant William of St. Benigne, and Novalese in 1027. The last is a curious example of monastic migration, for the original monastery had been founded in Bremen.[2]

But by this time—we are within the eleventh century and in the reigns of Henry II and Conrad II—the Cluny reform in Italy had ceased to be so much a reform as an anti-German and nationalist propaganda. The Italian who first saw the Cluny reform in this new light was Guido of Arezzo. He voiced the earliest deliberate formulation of mediaeval Italian nationalism in a letter to Herbert, archbishop of Milan and a bitter enemy of German rule in Italy, in 1031.[3] He was clever enough, though, to conceal his political purpose under the drapery of religion, and inveighed against the "simoniacal" practices of the German kings in denunciatory fashion. But "simony" with Guido meant not the *abuse* by the German kings of their appointive power to church offices in Italy, but the very exercise of that appointive power at all. He branded lay investiture as heresy and declared that countless thousands of Christians had suffered eternal damnation because of it. In this wise the agitation was artfully made to gain the support of the ignorant and terror-stricken lower classes in the Lombard cities. A national and popular Italian and anti-German party was thereby formed in Lombardy, of protest against "lay" investiture,

---

[1] Bern. et Bruel, *Recueil des Chartes de Cluny*, II, Nos. 1143, 1229, 1295.

[2] Bresslau, *Jahrbuch*, II, 164, n. 4; *Vita Odilonis*, II, 12.

[3] *Libelli de lite*, I, 1–4; Bresslau, III, 271–73; Waitz, VIII, 425.

"simony," and the marriage of priests, with a political undercurrent and a religious overcurrent of enmity against the German bishops. This was the Pataria, in which the Italian feudality, the lower priest class, the bourgeoisie of the rising towns, and the rabble were all commingled.

Milan now, and not Pavia as formerly, was the center of this agitation for Italian independence, but most of the cities of the Lombard plain were more or less partisans of the movement. Two Milanese clerks named Ariald and Landolph traveled from town to town, preaching in the churches, haranguing the populace in the public squares, and everywhere inveighing against the German bishops, the marriage of priests, simony, etc., in passionate and popular speech, seeking to fan the flame into open revolt and even going so far as to advocate the assassination of all German priests.[1]

The upper clergy in Lombardy, frightened by the violence of the agitation, implored the archbishop of Milan to suppress it. Ariald and Landolph were condemned in a synod which the arch-bishop convoked, and promptly appealed to Rome against the verdict. In 1056 Alexander II canceled the archbishop's excom-munication. The Pataria was formally recognized by the papacy.[2] In the next year Hildebrand, already the power behind the papal throne, and Anselm of Lucca, who had studied at Bec in Normandy under Lanfranc,[3] appeared in Milan as legates of the Holy See and concluded a papal-Patarian alliance, the league being under the captaincy of Landolph's brother Erlenbald, to whom Alexander II sent a special standard which he had blessed.[4] Thus officially recognized by Rome, the Pataria became bolder. The arch-bishop of Milan and the German hierarchy in North Italy generally, frightened by the popular fury and the thunders of the Lateran, bowed before the storm. In 1059 they advocated, outwardly at

[1] Arnulf, *Gesta epp. Mediol.*, III, 11, SS. VIII, 19.

[2] *Ibid.*, III, 13, p. 20; Andreas, *Vita Arialdi*, Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CLXIII, col. 1439, 1447.

[3] *Vita Alex.*, II; Labbé, *Concil.*, XII, 69.

[4] Arnulf, III, 14, p. 20; 16, p. 21; Bonizo, VI, 592; Andreas, 33, col. 1455; Bernold, *Annal.*, 1077, p. 305.

least, the Patarian program at the synod of Rome.[1]   The seeds of
that revolt against the imperial authority in Lombardy were already
sown which came to fruition in the reign of Frederick Barbarossa
in the formation of the league between the Lombard cities and the
papacy in 1167, when the independence of Lombardy was won on
the battlefield of Legnano (1178) and at the peace of Constance
(1183).   The papacy had scattered dragons' teeth in the imperial
path in Italy.

The eleventh century is one of the most fascinating of epochs
to the psychological historian, for a religious renaissance, so to
speak, then actuated Europe which took many and intense forms
of expression.   The Cluny reform and the crusades were the two
greatest of these.   But the variety of the stirrings of the new
consciousness was almost infinite.   Almost a craze for the building
of new and more magnificent churches developed, from which was
born the first positive example of mediaeval ecclesiastical archi-
tecture, the Romanesque.[2]   New heresies appeared, symptomatic
of fervent religious thought.[3]   Relic worship became a mania.[4]

[1] Petr. Dam., *Epp.* xlii, Vol. I, pp. 66–67; Arnulf, III, 14–15, p. 21; Bonizo, VI,
593; Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbuch*, I, 131.

[2] Rodolph Glaber's beautiful figure descriptive of this enthusiasm for church
building is famous: "contigit in universo pene terrarum orbe, precipue tamen in Italia
et in Galliis, innovari ecclesiarum basilicas. . . . . Erat enim instar ac si mundus
ipse, excutiendo semet, rejecta vetustate, passim candidam ecclesiarum vestem
indueret."—Book III, c. 4, sec. 13, ed. Prou.   For a vivid account of the building of
a monastery see Ord. Vit. *Hist. eccles.*, VIII, c. 27; Guibert de Nogent, *De vita sua*
[ed. Bourgin, 1907], 85, 110, 193–94, testifies to the same enthusiasm.   For literature
see Viollet le Duc, *Dict. d'architecture*, I, 107–30, 241–42; Merimée, *Études sur les arts
au moyen âge*, c. 1; Reinach, *Story of Art*, 98; Moore, *Gothic Architecture*, c. 1; Kurth,
Notger de Liège, I, c. 15; Rosières, *La chaire française*, II, c. 6; Mortet, *op. cit.*, Introd.,
xxxi–xlviii; Enlart, *Manuel de l'archéologie franc*, I, c. 4, especially pp. 202, 206,208–9.

[3] Rod. Glaber, Book II, c. 11; Book III, c. 8; Book IV, c. 2.   For literature see
Pfister, 325 f.; Lea, *Hist. of Inquisition*, I, 108 f.; Rosières, *La chaire française*, I,
c. 2; Sackur, II, 30–32; Rénan, *Averroes et averroisme*, 284 f.; Havet, *Bib. de l'école
des chartes*, XLI, 570 f.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, c. 13; Hahn, *Gesch. der Ketzer im
Mittelalter, besonders im 11, 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart, 1845.

[4] Rod. Glaber, Book III, c. 6; Petrus Venerabilis, *De miraculis*, Book 2 (Migne,
Patrol. Lat., 189); Guibert de Nogent, *De pignoribus sanctorum, ibid.*, CLVI, 607–79;
Lefranc, *Le traité des réliques de Guibert de Nogent* (in *Études Monod*); Duchesne, *Les
origines du culte chrétien*, 265–90; Reuter, *Gesch. der relig. Aufklärung im Mittelalter*,
I, 147 f.; Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, V, 267, 302–8; VII, 54 f.; Wattenbach, *Deutsch-
lands Geschichtsquellen*, II, 247 f., has good bibliography for Germany.

The Truce of God attempted to suppress the worst features of private war and made strong appeal to the popular mind.[1] Pilgrimages to the Holy Land enormously increased.[2] The first intimations of chivalry, that curious commingling of the ideals of a military society and of the faith of the Middle Ages, began to be manifest.[3]

In such an atmosphere the Cluny reform had operated until it became identified with Italian nationalist sentiment in Lombardy, with feudal resistance to the monarchy in Germany, and finally with the papacy, which saw in it, not merely an instrument for securing the independence of the church from secular control, but a means wherewith to overthrow the state.

This stage was reached between 1046 and 1056 with the ascendancy of Hildebrand in the curia in 1046 and the accession of Henry IV to the German throne in 1056. The first period of the Cluny reform was a genuine and legitimate movement for reformation of the mediaeval clergy, especially the monks. The second, or Hildebrandine, period was a huge political propaganda for the establishment of papal supremacy over the national churches and over the nations, masked under the guise of religion and morality.

When the Cluny reform had first entered Germany out of France the attitude of the German kings had not been one of hostility to it.[4] Henry II had encouraged the movement and can hardly be accused of merely playing politics because he used the reform in order to secularize much of the lands of the monasteries

---

[1] On the Truce of God see Luchaire, *Manuel*, 231–33 (bib.); Holtzmann, *Franz. Verfassungsgesch.*, 127, 129, 164 f., 153 (bib.); Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, II, 2, 133–38 (bib.).

[2] See Pfister, 344 f.; Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au moyen âge*, 42–54; Lalanne, *Des pèlerinages en Terre Sainte avant les croisades*, Bib. de l'école des chartes, 1845, 1; Riant, *Les établissements latins de Jérusalem au Xe siècle*, Mem. de l'acad. d. inscrip., XXI, Part II, pp. 151 f.; Lavisse, II, Part II, 81.

[3] Wattenbach, in *Deutschlands Geschichtsq.* (5th ed.), II, 217–23, has some admirable pages characterizing and summarizing the processes indicated in this paragraph. See also Flach, *Les origines de l'anc. France*, II, 431–579; Lavisse, II, Part II, pp. 139–43 (bib.); Luchaire, *Manuel* (index); Guilhiermoz, *L'origine de la noblesse en France au moyen âge;* Garreau, *L'état social de la France au temps des croisades*, 165–90. The close affiliation between Cluny and chivalry still is to be worked out.

[4] Lamprecht, II, 327.

whose misuse of their wealth had become a scandal, and which needed to be bled for their own health's sake.[1]   Conrad II had been a *Realpolitiker*.   But though he seems to have been without the religious sentiment of Henry II, in the main his ecclesiastical policy was sane and just.[2]

Henry III, however, was distinctly a man of the high eleventh century, one deeply and sincerely religious.   The argument of expediency was without force with him; his actions had to have a moral sanction as well.   This religious earnestness pervaded the whole working of his government.[3]   Henry III's marriage with Agnes of Poitiers, daughter of William V of Aquitaine,[4] undoubtedly accented his attachment for things French and inclined him more than ever to be favorable to the Cluny reform, for Cluny had been founded by a duke of Aquitaine, and the house had ever taken interest in its history.

No mediaeval German ruler assumed the crown under more favorable conditions or exercised his authority with greater power than did Henry III.   Of the six German duchies two only, Saxony and Lorraine, had independent dukes.   The four others, Franconia, Swabia, Bavaria, and Carinthia were in the king's hands.   From the Rhine to Moravia, from the Harz to the Brenta, Henry III was both duke and king.   But unfortunately Henry III was less practical than his predecessors and of a more refined education, and fell under the charm of the priest class.   The future was already determined when the emperor, without reservation, espoused the Cluny reform.   He was betrayed from the beginning of his reign by those in whom he reposed confidence.   His endeavor to put a stop to simony was more laudable than successful, for it chiefly diverted the revenues from appointment to church benefices from the treasury of the king into the pockets of his officials.[5]

---

[1] Hauck, III, 448 ff.   [2] Voigt, 3–8; Feierabend, 5.

[3] For estimates of the character of Henry III see Hauck, III, 572 f.; Nitzsch, II, 38–40; Gerdes, II, 119–21.

[4] Henry III's French marriage irritated the German clergy (Hauck, III, 571; and letter of Siegfried of Gorze to Poppo of Stavelot in Giesebrecht, II, 702 [4th ed.]).

[5] Henry III's sacrifice of the royal patronage financially embarrassed his government. He gave generously to the church, which already was perilously rich; the church at Goslar, for example, was given one-ninth of the income from the local crown lands.   At one time Henry III was so cramped for funds that he was compelled to pawn the crown jewels (Waitz, VIII, 292).

At the synod of Constance, at the close of a successful campaign against the Hungarians, in gratitude for the victory, and perhaps sentimentally affected by the recent death of his mother, the emperor publicly pardoned all his enemies.[1]   He petitioned Siegfried of Gorze, an austere reformer, to pray for him.[2]   He wanted to make Richard of St. Vannes in Verdun, the Cluniac leader in Germany, a bishop.   While the reform principles of Cluny appealed to his conscience, the Italian Camaldoli appealed to his religious emotion.[3]   He abandoned his father's unfinished and sensible plan for consolidated management of the royal abbeys. When agitation arose for establishment of the Truce of God in Germany also, as in France, Henry III, too sensitive of his prerogative avowedly to approve of a movement which in its very nature was a reflection on the ability of the crown to maintain law and order, sought to compromise by instituting the *Landfrieden* instead, which attempted to effect the purposes of the *treuga*, but saved the honor of the crown.   As a result neither purpose was wholly accomplished.   The *Landfrieden* was a revival of the old Carolingian ban re-enforced by the threat of ecclesiastical penalties.[4]

Yet Henry III was not clay in the hands of the Cluniacs.   His conception of his prerogative was perhaps even more theocratic than that of Charlemagne had been.   He treated the papacy as he would a bishopric.   Matters of faith were one field, politics was another.[5]   He was not afraid of collision with the Cluniacs and those bishops (and there were not a few at this time in Germany) who were tinctured with "reform," but he did not have the discernment to sense the danger in their opposition.

Meanwhile the immense significance of the Cluniac movement in Italy had been perceived north of the Alps.   In 1044 Henry promised the bishopric of Ravenna to a canon of Cologne named Widger, over the protest of a synod at Pavia.   The new bishop was so rash as to celebrate mass without yet having received formal investiture from the emperor.   For this breach he was summoned to the synod of Aachen, over which Henry III presided.   But when Widger was brought forward for trial Wazo, archbishop of Liège, declared that the emperor had no authority to summon an Italian

---

[1] Hauck, III, 572.   [3] Pfister, 312; Hauck, III, 572.

[2] Giesebrecht, II, 718.   [4] Bresslau, I, 448; Nitzsch, II, 39.   [5] Hauck, III, 577.

priest before a German ecclesiastical body, and that furthermore
only the pope had the right to appoint bishops.[1]   Italy, Lorraine,
and the Flemish lands had struck hands and were all linked to-
gether in organized protest by the Cluny reform, now a regular
political machine under papal direction.   The emperor stood by
his guns and deposed Widger, but it was a frontal attack upon
the German monarchy.   Two years later, when Henry offered the
archbishopric of Lyons to Halinard, abbot of St. Benigne, the
haughty abbot denied to the king's face his right of investiture and
refused to do homage to him at the diet of Speyer in August,
1046.[2]   This bold action was applauded by Richard of St. Vannes
and the bishop of Toul, the future Leo IX.

But events far more significant than these soon happened in
Italy.   In 1045 there were three rival popes in Rome.   To put an
end to this scandal Henry III called a synod at Pavia.   Peter
Damiani, a Cluniac of the "old school" and an enthusiastic admirer
of the Holy Roman Empire, who had sustained Henry in the recent
controversy over Widger,[3] was inclined to favor Gregory VI,
although he was alleged to have bought the papal office, because,
as pope, he had openly pronounced against simony.[4]   The emperor
hesitated and called another synod at Sutri, where all three popes
were deposed.[5]   When Adalbert of Bremen declined the honor,
Henry III chose the bishop of Bamberg, who took the name of
Clement II and crowned Henry emperor.   The Cluniacs sullenly
acquiesced, comforting themselves with the reflection that Clem-

[1] Hauck, III, 578–79; Sackur, II, 284; Hegel, *Städteverfassung von Italien*, II,
230; Nitzsch, II, 42; Bresslau, I, 309.

[2] Sackur, II, 274–75.   [3] *Ep.*, VII, 2.   [4] Jaffé-Wattenbach, 4130, 4, 126.

[5] A mystery still hangs over what happened at the synod of Sutri.   Did Henry III
depose Gregory VI, as he did the others, or did Gregory VI abdicate?   There can be
no doubt that he was legally pope, and there is ground to suspect that under Hilde-
brand's urgency the pope abdicated rather than to have the papacy humiliated by
an overt act of deposition performed by the emperor.   The act, in other words, was
done to save the theory of pontifical authority.   This action of self-sacrifice on the
part of Gregory VI may have been the reason why Hildebrand, when made pope
himself, took the name of Gregory too as a tribute to his friend.   If true, it shows
that Hildebrand was a master of intrigue or an ardent zealot of the "new" Clunyism.
See the interesting article by Sir Frederick Pollock, "The Pope Who Deposed Himself,"
in *English Historical Review*, X, 123–24, and compare Sackur, *Neues Archiv*, XXIV,
734 f.

ent II had also pronounced against simony. But when the new pope soon died and Henry appointed the bishop of Brixen as Damasus II, and a few months later, on his decease, Bruno of Toul became Leo IX, the triple exhibition of imperial control of the Holy See was too much for the Cluniacs. The archbishop of Liège bluntly told the emperor that he had no right to appoint the pope,[1] and in France an anonymous pamphlet was circulated against Henry.[2]

But the reform party quickly went from despair to elation. Henry III with his passionate idealism, his religious emotionalism, could not read men. Already he had naïvely appointed bishops imbued with Hildebrandine ideas to Italian sees.[3] Now he little realized, when he gave the papal scepter to his uncle Bruno of Toul, that he was undermining his own throne, for Leo IX proved to be a devoted Cluniac.[4] From his pontificate (1049–54) dates the immense influence of Hildebrand,[5] with whom worked Halinard of Lyons, a notorious ultramontanist,[6] Humbert, soon to be the author of a famous Cluniac tract, and a swarm of Lorrainer and Burgundian prelates.[7]

Hitherto the popes had been accustomed to assign the presidency of synods to legates. But Leo IX traveled from country to country and personally inquired, examined, authorized.[8] The keynote of the future was sounded at the synod of Rheims in October, 1049.[9] Three canons of that assembly were of great importance. The very first one read: *Ne quis sine electione cleri et populi ad regimen ecclesiasticum proberetur.*[10] The second forbade the purchase and sale of altars, church offices, or churches. The third made it obligatory upon all bishops to enforce the canons of election and installation. Bishop after bishop came forward and

[1] *Gesta epp. Leod.*, II, 65.

[2] *De ordine pontif.;* Hauck, III, 599; Sackur, II, 305, n. 2.

[3] Hauck, III, 609.

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 600; see Lamprecht's characterization, II, 308.

[5] *Ibid.*, 597, n. 1.

[6] Steindorff, *Jahrbuch*, II, 54, note.　　　[8] Hauck, III, 601 and note.

[7] Sackur, II, 314–15.　　　[9] Sackur, II, 322–23.

[10] Mansi, *Concilia*, XIX, cols. 796 f.; Bonizo rightly said of this legislation, *Haec gladium in viscera mersit inimici.*

made obeisance to the pope.[1]   From Rheims, Leo IX went to Mainz
where he received like homage.[2]   The pope preached to the people
in their own tongue, presided over the synod, and everywhere
proclaimed the teachings of the Cluny reform.   The changed rela-
tion between pope and emperor is significant.   The pope was
gradually and artfully edging the emperor out of his legal and
traditional headship of state and church.[3]

The immense moral prestige which the papacy acquired during
the pontificate of Leo IX was not lost; the cumulative force of
ideas and things carried the papacy forward and upward.   The
brief pontificate of Stephen X saw some of the fruits of his predeces-
sor's reign ripen.   Through the clever maneuvering of Hildebrand
and Anselm of Lucca the new pope qualified without the usual
formality of securing imperial approval.   This success was fol-
lowed by the bold stroke of Nicholas II in establishing the College
of Cardinals (1059) and thereby emancipating the papacy com-
pletely from any legal control by the imperial authority.[4]   The
minority of Henry IV, the weakness of the empress-mother Agnes,
the feud between Anno of Cologne and Adalbert of Bremen, at
this time compromised Germany to such a degree that the papacy
could do such revolutionary things almost without protest.[5]   The
provenience of these mid-century popes is instructive in this par-
ticular: Leo IX was an Alsatian, Stephen IX a native of Lorraine,
Nicholas II a Burgundian, Alexander II a Lombard.   In these
regions the Cluniac reform already had secured firm root.

The monasteries in the reign of Henry III had enjoyed a new
lease of prosperity to which they had been strangers since Henry II's
time.   In addition to recovering the right to elect their abbots,[6]
they were liberally endowed again, even acquiring once more con-
siderable parcels of the lands of which Henry II and Conrad II

---

[1] Hauck, III, 633.   [2] *Ibid.*, III, 615.

[3] For extended demonstration of this statement see Hauck, III, 600–615, and
Lübbersledt, *Die Stellung des deutschen Klerus auf päpstlichen Generalkonzilen von
Leo IX bis Gregor VII (1049–1085)*, Greifswald diss., 1911.

[4] On the establishment of the College of Cardinals see Meyer von Knonau,
Jahrbuch, I, 134 f.; Hefele, IV, 824 f.; Giesebrecht, *Münchner Jahrb.*, 1866; Gustav
Schober, *Das Wahldekret vom Jahre 1059*, Breslau diss., 1914.

[5] Hauck, III, 664.   [6] Nitzsch, II, 54.

had deprived them.[1] They were protected from the greed of the bishops.[2] The monastic chroniclers are unanimous in testifying to the prosperity of the abbeys under Henry III.[3]

But the monks ill repaid the crown for its generous treatment of them. Henry III's work was ruined in advance, his deeply religious nature abused, the very monarchy betrayed. The Cluny reform which he so favored was at bottom insidiously destructive of secular government.[4] The Cluniac monks who surrounded Henry III were secretly hostile to the German theory of government of a strong church within a strong state and were determined to reverse the relation. What they artfully called the "confusion" of temporal and spiritual authorities was not so in point of fact, for law and order was the ideal of and permeated the whole dual system. But it was this very law and order which maddened the Cluniacs. The mere existence of any sovereignty except that of the papacy was their ground of feud.

The German kings claimed the right of control of the German church because the German church had freely accepted the conditions under which its prosperity had developed. But a party had gradually grown up within the church which was eager to establish, not only ecclesiastical independence, but even ecclesiastical supremacy; which denied that the grants of the emperors had been made conditionally, or that the church had ever willingly entered into such a relation with the state. This party stigmatized all secular control of church offices as "simony," and found the readiest means to attain its end in a denial of the legality of lay investiture. This was the new teaching of the Cluny reform. The war of investiture was at bottom a contest for control of church patronage, and the root of the whole matter was the temporalities of the church. The contest was fundamentally motived by economic interest. Gregory VII and his successors strove to repudiate those feudal duties and obligations to both government and society which the church's possession of vast landed property naturally and legally entailed, *and at the*

---

[1] Bresslau, II, 138, n. 5; Feierabend, 6.

[2] For example, the case of intervention in the feud between Herbert, bishop of Eichstadt, and the abbot of Neuberg (Voigt, 15).

[3] Voigt, 19.   [4] Gerdes, II, 102.

same time to keep the church's lands.[1]   Whatever the weight
given to the influence in Gregory's mind of Augustinian ideas of a
Civitas Dei on earth, whatever the arguments of papal legists and
proponents, I am convinced that the papacy never would have
attempted to translate these vague, abstract aspirations into actual-
ity if the economic development of the church in Germany had not
stimulated the papal ambition and created the opportunity.
Naturally the popes kept this materialistic ambition in the back-
ground and forced the issue on other grounds.   It used phrases like
the "Rock of St. Peter" and the "Living Church" as clever watch-
words in order to conceal its real purpose and to cover its conduct
with the draperies of sanctity.   *But the real striving of the popes was
for wealth and power*, in the chief form in which wealth and power
were embodied in the feudal age, namely, *land.*

It is a mistake, however, to think that as yet Hildebrand had
complete control of the Cluniac party.   There was a radical and
a conservative wing in it, a left and a right.   Hildebrand, Cardinal
Humbert, and the famous curialist Placidus of Nonantula, repre-
sented the extreme faction.   Its position was that investiture was
wholly an ecclesiastical act, and that the grace which was admin-
istered through the bishop's office must not be sullied by any form
or degree of lay control.   It contended that the feudal authority
and the temporal functions of the bishop were merged within his
episcopal nature, and that no differentiation could be made between
them—a contention which was tantamount to depriving the state
of all the enormous resources and political authority vested in the
bishops by the emperors from Charlemagne down.[2]

[1] Placidus of Nonantula (1070).   "Quod semel ecclesiae datum est, in perpetuum
Christi est nec aliquo modo alienari a possessione ecclesiae potest, in tantum ut etiam
idem ipse fabricator ecclesiae, postquam eam deo voverit et consecrari fecerit, in ea
ieinceps nullum jus habere possit."—*Lib. de hon. eccles.*, c. 7.   Hinschius, II, 628.

[2] Humbert was the author of the tract *Adversus simoniacos* (1059), which may be
with right regarded as the opening gun of the Gregorian party.   It is printed in the
Libelli de lite, I, 95–253, and see comments of Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrb.* I, 104 f.;
Hauck, III, 674 f.; Lamprecht, II, 317 f.   There is a large literature on Cardinal
Humbert, e.g., Halfmann, *Kardinal Humbert, sein Leben und seine Werke* (1882);
Giesebrecht, *Kaiserzeit*, III, 19 f.; Meltzer, *Gregor VII u.d. Bischofswahl*, 37 f.;
Münchner histor. Jahrb. for 1886, 106 f.   On Placidus see Kayser, *Placidus von Nonan-
tula: De honore ecclesiae, ein Beitrag zur Investiturstreits* (Kiel, 1888).   His tract
is in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, CLXIII, 613 f.

On the other hand, Cardinal Damiani was not so radical.   He was a sincere admirer of the Holy Roman Empire and appreciated the debt which the church owed to the state.   He distinguished between the purely ecclesiastical and the feudo-temporal nature of the bishop's office, and advocated a double coronation ceremony for the bishops, which would give simultaneous and just expression to the claims of both church and state.   This is the germ of the idea which finally triumphed in the settlement at Worms in 1122.[1]

By the time of Hildebrand's ascendency over the papacy the division of Cluny into two parties, an old and a new—or what I have just called a "right" and a "left," amounted almost to a schism. The real Cluniac party was out of sympathy with the political designs of this radical minority.[2]   We are specifically told that Odilo sympathized with the work of Henry II and Conrad II in the reformation of the German monasteries;[3] that Henry III "loved him [Odilo] beyond measure and humbly adhered to his counsels."[4]   Cluny

. . . . had regarded with sympathetic interest every intervention of the emperors for the reform of the church from the days of Otto I to Henry III.   She had rejoiced at the purification of the papacy, at its gradual ascendency over the noble families at Rome, and at the attempt of the reformed papacy to tighten the reins of discipline over the bishop. . . . . But further than this she was not prepared to go, and when the movement under Stephen IX turned from the reform of the church to its freedom the Cluniac held back.   The anti-imperial bias of the new reform movement estranged his sympathies, and Cluny had perhaps stood too near to the emperors to get the proper perspective.   When, therefore, the movement for the freedom of the church took new impetus under Gregory VII, and when the latter worked to set the church above all worldly and temporal powers, the reformed monasteries took neither a decided nor a unanimous stand for the papacy. . . . . Against simony in the church and the marriage of priests Cluny cannot be shown to have been a pioneer. . . . . For

[1] Damiani argued that the act of royal investiture was *only* for the church lands and not for the office (*Ep.*, 13, cited by Bernheim, *Zur Geschichte d. Worms Konkordat*, 4).   See also Ficker in *Wiener Akad.*, *1872*, 100, and Kayser, 11.   Waitz, *DVG.*, VIII, 433–51, has admirably summarized the arguments and contentions of both parties.

[2] Hauck, III, 864.

[3] Odilo ordered the memory of Henry II to be regularly celebrated at Cluny (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLII, col. 1038; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI, 33, n. 7, 8).

[4] *Qui supra modum eum diligebat, illiusque consiliis humiliter adherebat.—Vita,* II, 12.

any organized campaign against either simony or the marriage of priests evidence is wanting.   Silence reigns on both points in the *Lives*. . . . . Dangerous as it may be to argue from silence, it is perhaps still more dangerous to maintain a theory which, with no other proofs, is built up in defiance of that silence.   On this point we believe Kerker's judgment to be sound,[1] while Hauck cites William of Dijon's zeal against simony as in striking contrast with the attitude of the other Cluniacs.[2]

The original Cluny reform was designed to purge the monasteries and to establish a new life within them.   It was indifferent to the condition of the secular clergy and held aloof from them, frowning upon those members of the order who were persuaded to accept episcopal appointments.[3]   Otherwise than this Cluny was chiefly interested in promoting the Truce of God,[4] pilgrimages, and church building.[5]   Even when the radical Hildebrandines captured the reform and twisted it to the ends of papal supremacy, Hugh of Cluny, although impotent to check the new tide, remained a conservative.   Gregory VII reproached him for his indifference in the war of investiture.[6]   Hugh was godfather to Henry IV and

---

[1] *William der Selige* (1863), 109.

[2] Hauck, III, 864.   The quotation is from L. M. Smith, "Cluny and Gregory VII," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI, 25–26.

[3] Miss Mary Bateson says (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, X, 140) that Odilo "had a strong desire to be himself a leader or general of an army of monks is very probable."

[4] Mansi, XIX, col. 593; Pfister, 164–73, 266.   The influence of chivalry upon Cluny is very interesting.   This fact is the pith of the satire of Adalberon, bishop of Laon (in Bouquet, X, 65), who attacked the military conception of monasticism in a fable which Miss Bateson has paraphrased, telling "how a doubt having arisen in a monastery as to the interpretation of contradictory precepts, the bishop considered the matter and sent one of the monks to Odilo for advice.   He returned in the evening mounted on a foaming steed.   The bishop could scarcely recognize him.   He wore a bearskin on his head, his gown was cut short and divided behind and before to make riding easier.   In his embroidered military belt he carried bow and quiver, hammer and tongs, a sword, a flint and steel, and an oaken club.   He wore wide breeches, and as his spurs were very long he had to walk on tiptoe.   The bishop asked: 'Are you my monk whom I sent out?'   He answered: 'Sometime monk, but now a knight. I here offer military service at the command of my sovereign who is King Odilo of Cluny.'"—*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, X, 140.   See further: Hückel, *Les poèmes satiriques d'Aldeberon*. Bib. de la faculté des lettres de Paris, fasc. xiii, 1901.   For the influence of Cluny on pilgrimages, see Pfister, 344 f.

[5] Cf. page 5 (3).

[6] Jaffé, II, 81; *Reg.*, I, 62, p. 81; VI, 17, p. 351; VIII, 2 and 3, p. 429; VIII, 52. Cited by Smith in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI, 29.

finally, according to Berthold the annalist, was excommunicated for his loyalty to the emperor,[1] and when Henry IV was put under the papal ban the monks of Cluny prayed for him.[2] At the conference at Tribur and Oppenheim, Hugh was with the emperor and did his best to mitigate the verdict.

The real originator of the "new" Clunyism, i.e., the movement to abolish lay investiture in order to elevate the papacy over the state, was Wazo of Liège. But with political Clunyism the conservatives of the order had no sympathy. Peter Damiani was an admirer of the Holy Roman Empire; the *Lives* of Majolus and of Odilo emphasize respect for secular authority and secular dignitaries.[3] To Abbo of Fleury "ascendency of the crown over both worldly and spiritual dignities was the foundation of all public law."[4] Majolus' refusal of the papacy when it was proffered him by Otto II "showed no consciousness that such power of choice did not lie with the emperor."[5] Imperialistic Clunyism was born in Rome, not in France. The unapprehended thought of Wazo and Cardinal Humbert was seized by the mind of Hildebrand, who, as Pope Gregory VII, converted it into a thunderbolt: "Man darf geradezu sagen dass eine Parteibildung überhaupt nur von Rom ausgehen konnte."[6] It has been well said that "the century which is called the century of Gregory VII, with much better reason might be called the age of Cluny. For it was only because he was the greatest of the Cluniacs that Gregory became the greatest of the popes."[7]

[1] Berthold, *Annal.*, 289; for Hugh's activity in favor of Henry IV see Paul Bernried, *Gregor VII*, c. 7, Nos. 56–59; Lambert of Hersfeld, 290, 294, ed. Holder Egger.

[2] D'Achery, *Spicelegium* (ed. 1723), III, 426. "Neque tamen debita poenitentia errorem cognitum emendavit."—Letter of Halinard of Lyons to Countess Matilda.

[3] *Vita Majoli*, I, 7; *Vita Odilonis*, I, 7.

[4] Smith, "Cluny and Gregory VII," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI, 23; cf. Sackur, II, 305. Duke William of Aquitaine broke up the synod of Poitiers in 1078, though a papal legate was present (Mansi, XX, 495). Mr. Smith rightly says that "the Cluniacs do not seem to have preached any special doctrine as to the papal power."— *Op. cit.*, 23.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Hauck, III, 515; cf. Grützmacher, *Realencyclopädie für protestantliche Theologie*, XIII, 183. Wazo enjoyed high repute in Flanders and the Rhinelands as a canonist, and it is to be remembered that Hildebrand had once studied at Cologne.

[7] Dehio and Bezold, *Gesch. der christl. Baukunst im Mittelalter*, I, 387.

For six successive pontificates, from that of Leo IX to his own as-
cension of the throne of the Fisherman in 1073, Hildebrand was
the power behind the papal chair. During that period the Cluny
reform had become an organized and formidable propaganda di-
rected by the Holy See; the creation of the College of Cardinals
had emancipated the papacy from secular interference; papal
power in Europe had been consolidated, especially through the
creation of the papal legates;[1] the financial resources of the popes
had materially increased, both through extension and through
improved methods of collection; the states of the church were
solidly buttressed on either hand by the establishment of papal
suzerainty over the kingdom of Norman Italy, and the close alliance
effected between the papacy and Countess Matilda of Tuscany,
a strong papal partisan and ruler of the most extensive and compact
territory north of the Norman kingdom.

In Gregory VII's brain were blended a huge ideal and a prac-
tical, vivid political program. There was nothing vague or indefi-
nite about either. Using the current feudal conceptions of the time
he held that God was supreme suzerain of the world, that the pope
was God's vicar and vassal, that every secular authority, every state,
was to be held within the overlordship of the pope, that national gov-
ernments were not rightfully independent sovereignties, but *imperia
in imperio*, that the church was both a political and an ecclesiastical
empire as wide as Christendom and as high as heaven. He claimed
all Italy, with Corsica and Sardinia, as the "States of the Church"

---

[1] Engelmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahr-
hunderts*, Marburg, 1913. For other literature on the institution of the papal legates
see Werminghoff, 205. Gregory VII's legates were nearly all radical Cluniacs, as
Hugh the Venerable, with whom Gregory continually consulted (*Vita St. Gregor.*,
AASS., Bolland., May, VI, 115; *Reg.* Greg., VII, 6; Labbé, *Concil.*, VI, 17; Hug.,
Epp., IV, 22); Odon and Gérault, priors of Cluny (*Reg.* Greg. I, c. 62; *AASS., Ord.
Ben.*, IX, 786); Hugh, the prior of St. Marcel de Châlons, who suspended the arch-
bishops of Rheims, Tours, Bourges, and Besançon and convoked no less than ten
synods or councils (Hug., Flav. *Chron.*, 194; Berthold, *Annal.*, 1078); Simon of Valois,
abbot-prior of La Chaise-Dieu and later of St. Benigne, who was Gregory's ambassador
to Robert Guiscard (Hug., Flav. *Chron.*, 229); Bernard of St. Victor in Marseilles,
legate in Spain and Germany, where he presided over the diet of Forchheim which
deposed Henry IV, and was papal agent among the revolted Saxons (Berthold, *Annal.*,
1078–79; *Epp.* Greg., VII, 15); Richard, a brother of Bernard of St. Victor, who also
served in Spain (*AASS., Ord. Ben.*, IX, 488).

in virtue of the alleged donation of Constantine; that "Spain belonged of old to St. Peter," and that this right had never been lost, although the land had been occupied by the infidel; that Hungary belonged to the Roman church by gift of King Stephen; that Charlemagne had given Saxony to the Holy See; that "the empire is a fief of Rome."

With less pretension and more concreteness Gregory VII tried to convert the conferring of the bishop's pallium and his episcopal oath into an act of homage and oath of vassalage to the pope as the bishop's immediate overlord. Except the requirement of celibacy, no demand of Gregory so stirred the opposition of the episcopate, for it outraged their national sentiments as well as impugned their long-established political attachment to the emperor.

The most practical and the most successful of Gregory VII's reforms was in the field of church finance. His achievements in this particular field testify to his administrative capacity and the essentially material nature of his aims and projects. Ever since the ninth century, owing to the violence and insecurity of the feudal régime, it had been the practice of weaker proprietors to commend themselves to the stronger; sometimes the latter were bishops or abbots. But many churches and monasteries, in order to protect themselves from feudal spoliation, gradually fell into the way of putting themselves under the patronage of the papacy. Through this practice the pope often became the eminent proprietor of lands of churches and monasteries widely scattered in Europe. These foundations, thus liberated from any other human control, lay or clerical, and protected against spoliation by apostolic anathema, recognized this protection by paying an annual sum (*cens*) into the papal treasury. Under various forms the papal patronage was spread over hundreds of churches and monasteries in Germany, France, and Italy. Gregory VII saw in the practice both a means to extend his authority and a means to reduce the power of the bishops, and a lucrative source of papal revenue as well, and so widely extended the system.

Not only ecclesiastical establishments, but private nobles and even towns appeared upon the revenue rolls of the papacy as "wards" paying for papal protection. The pope thus became, as has been

justly said, "a veritable suzerain, to whom both homage and money service was due." If we add to these resources the sums derived from the Peter's Pence, from administrative fees of many sorts, and from the Patrimonium Petri, it is evident that not for nothing had Hildebrand been *oeconomicus* of the Roman church before his elevation to the pontificate.[1]

It is difficult for a modern scholar accurately to evaluate the motives and practices of the Cluny reform and to do justice simultaneously to both state and church. On the one hand, one must guard against judging the history of the eleventh century by the standards and practices of the twentieth; on the other hand, it requires an effort of the historical imagination to appreciate the theories and to visualize the conditions which then prevailed.

It may be premised, however, that the absolute and complete separation of church and state was an impossibility in the feudal age. Granting this, there were two alternative courses open: (1) to define the sphere of authority of each in such a way as to give simultaneous and due expression to the sovereignty of each without jeopardy to the other by the determination of the *reserved* or particular rights of each, and at the same time to provide for enough articulation between the two in order to enable them to function together by specific delegation and concurrent jurisdiction; (2) failing the establishment of the coequality of each in separate spheres, the other alternative was either the supremacy of state over church or that of church over state.

It may be objected that the first solution was incompatible with the Germanic form of government created by the Saxon and continued by the Franconian emperors. This is probably true. But there are clear indications that such a solution was possible. The reigns of Henry II and Henry III had shown that the political functioning of the church did not necessarily exclude its spiritual working. The church, i.e., the radical wing of the Cluny reform which dominated it after 1049, was really the uncompromising party. For it was resolutely bent upon achieving the supremacy of the papacy over both church and state.

---

[1] See on this subject Waitz, VII, 218–20; Schreiber, I, 9 f.; II, 463 f.; Werminghoff, 70, n. 4, 184–85; Blumenstock, *Der päpstliche Schutz im Mittelalter* (Innspruck, 1890); Hauck, III, 865 f.

The just and reasonable remedy, if the church chafed under its relation to the state, would have been for the church to renounce its feudal possessions and its feudal rights and privileges—lands, countships, coinage and market grants, octrois, regalian perquisites in general—and to be content with its allodial lands, which were of vast extent in themselves. Radical as this solution would have been in the feudal age, it was thought of and suggested. The imperial government was willing to make the performance, but the church was too rich to make the sacrifice. It was determined to keep its lands and privileges, but to repudiate the obligations to the state which it had assumed with their possession—a policy little less than robbery under the guise of religion. Firmly resolved upon this course from the time of Hildebrand's ascendency at Rome, there was only one way for the church to attain its ends, namely, to establish its sovereignty over the state. When the state resisted the church went to the length of seeking to destroy the state, to dissolve the historical and legal bonds which centuries had developed, by organizing rebellion and creating anarchy. In a word, the policy of the Gregorian church was a rule or ruin one. It was a policy of no compromise, not even shrinking from the annihilation of civil society.[1]

The struggle between the mediaeval empire and the papacy, some of the history of which has been anticipated in the preceding paragraphs in order to show the nature of it, began openly at the death of Henry III in 1056. The Hildebrandine party, already in league with the Pataria and the Lombard nobility, had also effected an alliance with the feudality of Western and Southern Germany.

[1] "The piety of the Carolings and the Saxons brought a nemesis in the end, for one of the main agents in the downfall of the mediaeval empire was the territorial ambition of the princes of the church."—Fisher, I, 81. Cf. Nitzsch I, 390; Waitz, VII, 202–3. There is enormous significance in the words of Theoderich, *De reb. Norv.*, c. 5 [Langebek, V, 316], speaking of the policy of Otto II: "Iste est . . . . qui ecclesiam omnemque clerum plus honorabat et pene plus ditabat quam expediret, subdendo ei pheodatos duces et comites. Nam ex opulentia nata postea insolentia, ut usque hodieque est cernere. Unde et illi, ut in Romana historia reperitur, ab angelo est dictum: 'Venenum addidisti ecclesie.'" Cf. also Gerhoh, *De aedif. Dei*, c. 9. The *Dictatus Papae*, sec. 27, had theoretically formulated the principle that the pope could dissolve the secular organization of society: "That he [the pope] may absolve subjects from their oath of fidelity to wicked rulers." Gregory VII gave it practical application in the first deposition and banning of Henry IV in 1076, which threw Germany into the throes of a long civil war.

"Reform" was the vehicle for expression of the enmity of the German dukes toward the crown. Feudalism and the papacy were leagued together.

The chief seat of the movement was Lorraine, perhaps the most refractory of all the feudal principalities in Germany. In the time of Otto I the duke Gilbert had coquetted with France and the arch-bishop Frederick of Mainz who had so resisted Otto's church policy. Under Otto II, Otto III, Henry II, and Conrad II, there had been new plots for French intervention vaguely identified with the French reform movement. But with Henry III the compact between the feudal elements in Lorraine and the Hildebrandine "reform" became close. The whole rule of the German kings over the lands in the valleys of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Moselle was challenged. Most of the religious houses in this vast region were peopled with offspring of the local feudal families, and Henry III had been unwise enough to permit the bishoprics of Lorraine to be filled with representatives of this local aristocracy, thus letting the strongest instrument of his government of Lorraine, the episcopate, slip out of his hand. Hermann II of Cologne was made arch-chancelor of the apostolic see; Bruno of Toul became Pope Leo IX.[1] The feudal aristocracy of Lorraine, and the bishops, most of whom were of noble birth, combined their political aspirations with the Cluny reform and worked together against the monarchy. The identification of the Cluny reform in Germany with the elements and forces of feudal particularism and revolt is plain. The abbey of St. Vannes in Verdun quadrupled its landed wealth in certain years owing to the generosity of the nobles of Lorraine.

This double feudal and "reform" tendency was incarnated in the person of Duke Godfrey of Upper Lorraine, a redoubtable warrior and a born adventurer, who was descended from the ancient counts of Verdun.[2] Expelled from his duchy by Henry III, who

---

[1] Hauck, III, 482 f.; Sackur, II, 152 f.; Gerdes, II, 519 f. Lambert of Hersfeld (anno 1071, ed. Holder-Egger), 133, clearly shows the intimate relation subsisting between the high German feudality and the Cluny reform, " . . . . principes regni ad instituendam in Galliis divini servicii scolam Transalpinos monachos evocabant, nostrates autem, quicumque in illorum instituta ultro concedere noluissent, de mon-asteriis cum ignominia eiciebant."

[2] Petr. Damien. *Epp.*, VII, 10, p. 450; *Triumph. Remacli*, I, 11, SS. XI, 443; Leo Ostiens, *Chron. Cass.*, xi, 97.

awoke too late to the danger of the situation in Lorraine, Godfrey, in 1051, wandered over the Alps to Italy, where he captivated Beatrice, the widowed marchioness of Tuscany, whose daughter was the great Countess Matilda, and married her.[1] Thus the string of border states along the French edge of the empire clear to Rome were bound together in a papal-feudal association between 1046–55 against the German monarchy.[2] Yet Henry III's eyes were so sealed to the real import of things that on his deathbed he commended Empress Agnes and the little Henry IV to Godfrey's care.[3] The ramifications of the Hildebrandine-Lorraine intrigue even penetrated into Bavaria in Henry III's reign. In 1042 Henry, son of Count Frederick of Luxemburg (who was also vogt of St. Maximin in Trier) was made duke of Bavaria by Henry III, who gave it out thus instead of holding it in the hands of the crown as he should have done. Thus the feudo-papal program became identified with Bavarian sentiments of ducal autonomy also.[4]

ADDENDUM

Since this article has been typed and page-proofed, Professor R. L. Poole has published a study entitled "Benedict IX and Gregory VI" (*Proceedingsof the British Academy*, Vol. VIII). I have not seen the original article, but a review of it in the *English Historical Review*, April, 1918, pp. 278–79, states that—

Mr. Poole shows that the usual version that there were three popes co-existing at the same time, whom the emperor Henry III had deposed in 1046, is a mere popular tale given out, he considers, by the imperial entourage, for Benedict IX had abdicated and the anti-pope Sylvester III (John bishop of the Sabina) had abandoned his claims. In fact, at Sutri the reigning pope Gregory VI was deposed for simony, and at Rome the ex-pope Benedict IX was also deposed, presumably because the validity of his abdication was considered doubtful. It would be a natural source of the tale of the three rival popes. . . . Mr. Poole further makes it probable that the Tusculan popes, though no model ecclesiastics, have been painted in over-dark colors; and gives an explanation of the descent of Gregory VI and his connection with Gregory VII which satisfactorily combines the available evidence.

---

[1] Dupréel, *Hist. crit. de Godfrey de Le Barbu*, 59 f.

[2] Nitzsch, II, 47–48.   [3] Lamprecht, II, 266.   [4] Gerdes, II, 68.